UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,438	09/11/2003	Branko D. Kovacevic	1458-0200220	7502
	7590 01/26/201 /MAN & ABEL, LLP	EXAMINER		
5914 WEST CO	OURTYARD DRIVE	BATES, KEVIN T		
SUITE 200 AUSTIN, TX 7	8730		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2456	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/26/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/660,438	KOVACEVIC, BRANKO D.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
KEVIN BATES	2456		

	REVIN DATES	2430	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>18 January 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, wwith 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f		FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN 1000
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrumer 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL		eu	
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	sideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	**	ducing or cimplifying t	ha iaawaa far
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	er form for appeal by materially red	auding or simplifying ti	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 			_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-5,7-13,46-57,59,63 and 67-71. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u> 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	hefere or on the date of filing a Ne	ation of Annual will not	ha antarad
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
10. [_] Outer			
	/KEVIN BATES/		
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2456	
	•		

Applicant's election with traverse of the restriction mailed November 16, 2009 in the reply filed on January 18, 2010 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the groups are independent and distinct, plus there is no burden. This is not found persuasive because the idea of processing packets based on packet length is an issue addressed in the fields such as variable message length communication system rather than fixed packet lengths. This feature is addressed in many systems that have no relation to determining protocols of packets, but many other systems not addressed or related to the first group of claim limitations. As result, the claim is directed to a system that distinct to the previously presented invention and would require and undue burden based on the new field of search that is required to consider the new and distinct invention that is now claimed.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

The claim amendments filed January 18, 2010 have been entered and the 35 USC 112 rejection is hereby withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments filed January 18, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding claim 1, the applicant argues that a TSID differs from the claimed start code. The examiner disagrees; the required aspect of a "start code" in the claim is any identifier or code that is used to help identify the protocol of an incoming data or multi-media stream. The TSID code recited in Okamoto performs that function in that system, so by the definition of a start code required in the claim, in light of the specification, does not differ from the TSID code of the reference.

Regarding claim 67, the applicant argues that the Okamata does not teach a set of physical interface parameters. The examiner disagrees; Okamata teaches the ability to receive and interpret data streams in multiple formats (Col. 23, lines 18 - 67) including based on a determined format out of a plurality of format handing the interfacing of the data stream (Col. 27, line 35 - Col. 28, line 67).